



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,893	01/12/2002	Koteswerrao Adusumilli	42390P12318X	3131

7590 02/22/2008
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,893

Applicant(s)

ADUSUMILLI, KOTESHWERRAO

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN

Art Unit

2134

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Request for Continued Examination has been accepted and entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33, 42, 50, and 56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in view of Halme US 7,099,284.

The examiner has interpreted the term "data center" with the broadest reasonable interpretation. The examiner encourages the applicant to further define "data center" in order to overcome the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33-36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48, 50, 51, 52, and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Kramer US 2002/0099957 in view of Halme 7,099,284.

As per claims 33, 42, 50, and 56 Stewart teaches an interface to receive data from at least one wired client device and one wireless client device, (Col 8 lines 47-55). Stewart teaches logic to determine if the device is wired or wireless, (Col 7 lines

43-62, Col 8 lines 20-30). Stewart teaches requesting a secure connection from a wired or wireless device, (Col 13 lines 33-43). Stewart teaches that the client is authenticated in establishing a connection with the wired or wireless device, (Col 14 lines 29-44).

Stewart does not teach SSL, WTLS or converting encrypted data to an unencrypted format.

Kramer teaches a security format conversion system including from SSL WTLS, [0024], [0050]. Kramer teaches converting the encrypted data to a different format (encryption/decryption) [0050]. Kramer teaches a network interface and a server to receive converted data, [0049]. It is well known in the art that the port used and key exchanged in SSL, and WTLS indicate the recipient decrypt the encrypted data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the protocols of Kramer with the system of Stewart because SSL and WTLS are widely accepted and compatible protocols.

Halme teaches using a VPN protocol where encrypted data is sent from one private network over a public network to a second private where it is decrypted at a node and forwarded over a private network lan (data center) (Col 1 lines 20-35, Col 3 lines 35-55, Fig 3). It is well known in the art that SSL is used with VPN protocol. It is well known that Lans may contain multiple clients and servers.

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the VPN of Halme with the previous combination because it allows end to end security.

As per claim 34, Stewart teaches that the device has an interface to transmit data and to receive data from a server, (Col 14 lines 16-22).

As per claims 38, 45, and 52, Stewart teaches requesting a digital certificate of the client and authenticating that certificate, (Col 14 lines 19-22, 29-33).

As per claims 35, 36, 40, 43, 48, 51, 54, and 55 Stewart does not teach protocols or determining the client type dependent on protocol.

Kramer teaches a security format conversion system including from SSL or WTLS, [0050].

As per claims 57, and 58 Kramer teaches that all decryption takes place in a VPN server or firewall, which is located between a public network and a data center server, [0049], Fig 3.

Claims 37, 41, 44, 46, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Kramer US 2002/0099957 in view of Halme 7,099,284 in view of Douglas US 2004/0010684.

As per claims 37 and 44, Stewart fails to teach sending a certificate from the server to the client.

Douglas teaches a handshaking technique where the client and server exchange certifications and digital signatures to authenticate each other, [0031], [0032].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the handshaking technique of Douglas with the system of Stewart-Kramer- Halme because it allows the client to authenticate the server thus ensuring that the client is not communicating with an unauthorized party.

As per claims 41, and 49, Stewart-Kramer-Halme fails to teach receiving a digital signature from the client device and validating said signature.

Douglas teaches a handshaking technique where the client and server exchange certifications and digital signatures to authenticate each other, [0029], [0030] [0031].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the digital signatures of Douglas with the system of Stewart in order to confirm that data had not been manipulated in transit.

As per claim 46, Stewart –Kramer-Halme fails to teach verifying the validity period of the certificate.

Douglas teaches including a timestamp in the signed message, and validating said message, [0028], [0029]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2134

the art to use the timestamp of Douglas with the certificate of Stewart because it would prevent replay attacks [Douglas 0028].

Claims 39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Kramer US 2002/0099957 in view of Halme 7,099,284 in view of Hajmiragha US 6,289,460

As per claims 39, and 47, Stewart-Kramer- Halme does not teach using a URL with a digital certificate.

Hajmiragha teaches sending a link, rather than the actual digital certificate, (Col 4 lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system of Stewart with the link of Hajmiragha, because the link prevents interception and modification of a digital certificate between parties.

Claims 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart US 6,571,221 in view of Kramer US 2002/0099957 in view of Halme 7,099,284 in view of Stubblebine US 6,216,231

As per claim 53, Stewart-Kramer- Halme does not teach updating a short lived server certificate based on a user defined interval.

Stubblebine teaches updating a short lived server certificate based on a user defined interval, (Col 15 lines 25-36).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the updating certificates of Stubblebine with the Stewart-Kramer-Halme combination because short lived certificates increase security.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on (571)272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher J. Brown/
Examiner, Art Unit 2134

2/16/08

